

LUC-430/ Mutha 1

15

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**Rejection Under Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales and Jacobi**

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15 and 19-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Number 6,324,582 issued to Sridhar on November 27, 2001 and U. S. Patent Application Number 2002/0075304 issued to Thompson dated June 20, 2002 and U. S. Patent Number 6,901,139 issued to Gonzales on May 31, 2005, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,584,095 issued to Jacobi on June 24, 2003.

Applicant has avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

First, applicant's claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"one or more server components operable to communication with one or more router components, wherein the one or more server components employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more Internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, and wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of:

a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices;

an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices;

an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and

a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices;

wherein the one or more server components assign a static internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices, and wherein the one or more server components employ at least one of the one or more identifiers and one or more screening preferences to direct a voice over Internet Protocol

LUC-430/ Mutha 1

16

(VOIP) call as one of one or more messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices, and wherein at least one of the one or more screening preferences is an alert preference which directs the communication devices to employ a different ring tone or message alert for the one or more messages or calls."

As stated in the Final Office Action, Sridhar, Thompson and Gonzales do not teach or suggest "wherein the one or more server components assign an internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices". Since Sridhar, Thompson and Gonzales do not disclose a server component that assigns an internet protocol address, they cannot teach or suggest a server component that assigns a static internet protocol address. Moreover, applicant notes that Jacobi does not teach or suggest a server component that assigns a static internet protocol address either.

This is because Jacobi discloses a server that assigns dynamic rather than static internet addresses, as stated in column 2, lines 46-56 and column 4, lines 20-35. Thus, Jacobi, similar to Sridhar, Thompson and Gonzales, is missing the "wherein the one or more server components assign a static internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices" elements, as recited in applicant's claim 1.

Therefore the proposed combination of Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales and Jacobi does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicant's claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-14 and 22-29 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claims 15, 21 and 30 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by the proposed combination of Sridhar, Thompson Gonzales and Jacobi. For example, claim 15 recites, "assigning, via one or more server components, a static internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices" and claim 21 recites "means in the computer-readable medium for assigning, via one or more server components, a static internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices" and claim 30 recites "wherein the one or more router components assign a static internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices". The proposed combination of Sridhar, Thompson Gonzales and Jacobi does not teach or suggest these limitations for the above-mentioned

LUC-430/ Mutha 1

17

reasons. Therefore, claims 15, 21 and 30 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 16-20 depend from claim 15, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Rejections Under Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales, Jacobi, Conrath, Maes and Brooks

Claims 3-4 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Gonzales, Jacobi and Thompson, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 7,103,770 issued to Conrath on September 5, 2006.

Claims 12, 18 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales, Jacobi and Conrath as applied to claims 1-11, 14-17 and 19-21, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 7,047,305 issued to Brooks on May 16, 2006.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales, Jacobi, Conrath, and Brooks as applied to claims 1-12 and 14-21, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,801,604 issued to Maes on October 5, 2004.

Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection.

These rejections are based on the rejection under Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales and Jacobi being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein the one or more server components assign a static internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices", as recited in applicant's independent claim 1, and "assigning, via one or more server components, a static internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices" as recited in applicant's independent claim 15, and "means in the computer-readable medium for assigning, via one or more server components, a static internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices" as recited in applicant's independent claim 21, and "wherein the one or more router components assign a static internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices", as recited in applicant's independent claim 30, the combination of Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales, Jacobi, Conrath, Maes and Brooks does not supply these missing elements. Thus,

LUC-430/ Mutha 1

18

these combinations do not make obvious any of applicant's claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitations.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



James Milton
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,935

Dated: May 14, 2010

CARMEN PATTI LAW GROUP, LLC
Customer Number 47382
(312) 346-2800